(SRI A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY.)

there is no delay. I would like to know which information is correct.

MR. SPEAKER.—A reply has been given. The Hon'ble Member may judge on the reply and make his own inference. So far as the Government is concerned, they say, there is no inconsistency in the reply.

SRI ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—May I know whether it is in the discretion of the Government to say 'yes' or 'no' to any question in the interest of public or whether it is permissible or open to the Speaker to decide whether a question or the answer is in the public interest or not.

MR. SPEAKER.—I am sorry I have to deal with the whole position. I would like to see that the office issues a note in this respect. So far as I can give information, when a question is asked, the Government may give a reply. If the reply is incorrect, I can ask the Government and point out to them that it is incorrect and it may be corrected, if there is any inconsistency. If the Government were to say that they cannot give a reply, I cannot compel the Government to give a reply. The Hon'ble Member Sri Anna Rao will agree that I have to be guided by rules. I cannot in any way take the wishes of the House as granted because I have to be guided by the rules. If the Government were to keep silent and donot want to give a reply, I cannot compel them to give a reply. If they give an inconsistent reply or incorrect reply which is obvious on the face of it, I can compel the Government to give a proper reply. There is another point. If the Government were to say that it is of a confidential nature, I have no power to compel them to give the information.

SRI ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—The question just now is, if the reply or the information required is not of a confidential nature but still it is persisted that it is of a confidential nature, then is it open to the Speaker to give his decision or not.

MR. SPEAKER.—I have been saying that I have no power to judge whether it is of a confidential nature or not. I desire to refer the Hon'ble Members in this respect to May's 'Parliamentary Procedure.' This point was some time back discussed in the former Bombay Legislative Assembly. At that time, I was myself presiding. We went through the whole question and the Chair came to the conclusion that it had no power when the Government replied that it was of a confidential nature. Therefore, I cannot compel the Government at all to give the information. I think that is the end of the matter. Now question time is over.

Member's Representation.

SRI A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY (Bangalore South).—I have to represent something to the Chair. On page 13 of the Rules of Procedure of this House, Rule 38 lays down like this:—

> "Where the form or the subject matter of a question is, in the opinion of the Speaker, in contravention of the rules, he may amend the question to secure its compliance with the rules and inform the member concerned accordingly."

Rule 37 reads like this:

> "The Speaker, at the request of a Minister, may direct that an answer to a question which has been called may be given on the ground of public interest, even though the question is not put or the member in whose name it stands is absent."

There is another Rule 36, which runs like this:

> "The Minister or non-official member to whom a supplementary question is addressed may decline to answer it without notice, in which case, the supplementary question may be put only in the form of a fresh question at a subsequent session of the Assembly."

MR. SPEAKER.—I do not know what purpose is served by reading all this.

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY.—The point is where the Government refuses to answer a supplementary on the ground that it is of a confidential nature, it is not enough, it should also be considered confidential in the opinion of the Speaker. Otherwise, he can direct the Government to provide the answer.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member is referring to Rule No. 37. Rule No. 37 is of a different character altogether. A member tables a certain question. Suppose a member is absent from the House. The point is whether the Speaker can compel the Treasury Benches, the Hon'ble Ministers, to answer a question. He may do so, if it is in the public interest. That is a different matter. But if the Government were to say that an answer to a question is of a confidential nature, there is absolutely no power for the Chair to compel the Government to give the reply. There are two things in Rule 37. Firstly the member should be absent and secondly there should be a request from the Minister that the answer may be given. In that case, power lies with the Speaker to compel the Minister to give a reply. In this case, if the Government were to say that it is not in the public interest to disclose the answer as it is of a confidential nature, the Chair has no right to compel them.

MEMBERS SWORN.

Sri B. Singri Gowda (Magadi).

Sri S. Sharan Gowda (Jewargi).

Adjournment Motions (Mode of Disposal).

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before we start with the other business of the House, I have to make an announcement. Two adjournment motions have been tabled by two Hon'ble Members Sri M. Ramappa and Sri K. T. Dasappa. I have disallowed them. Usually, the practice is that when an adjournment motion is patently inadmissible, it is disallowed by the Speaker in the chamber and a letter is addressed to the Hon'ble Member and no reference is made in this behalf. In this case what happened is, Sri Ramappa referred this matter yesterday and wanted to know as to what the fate of his adjournment motion was. So, I have to make a few observations in this respect, *i.e.*, that the adjournment motions of Sri M. Ramappa and Sri K. T. Dasappa have been disallowed by me and a letter to that effect would be addressed to them. The reasons would also be given in that letter. By the way, I may also mention that when other parliamentary opportunities are normally available to Hon'ble Members to express their opinion on the matter, an adjournment motion is not allowed. On the discussion of the Motion of Thanks, Sri Ramappa has also tabled an amendment covering the matter of the adjournment motion. So, he has ample opportunity. He can also raise this question by means of a short notice question. It will be answered by the Minister and the member can raise a half-an-hour's discussion on that. So, I think there is no necessity to allow this adjournment motion which could be discussed evidently on other occasions.

Similar is the fate of the adjournment motion of Sri K. T. Dasappa. We are amending the rules and we will have more opportunities such as, bringing to the notice of the Minister certain matter of public interest and asking him to make a statement and secondly to raise the question in the House. These are not available for the present under the present rules. These are available in the Lok Sabha and the Rules-making Committee has adopted these rules. These rules would be available to Hon'ble Members soon and a day would be given when Hon'ble Members would debate the rules and adopt them.

This being so, I am extremely sorry that I am not able to admit these adjournment motions of my Hon'ble friends.